

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Final Office Action dated February 15, 2005 wherein the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,724,465) ("Krauss") in view of Pracht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,506,482) ("Pracht"). Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Final Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the support panels comprise "a perimeter" in order to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation "said support panels having an integral angled edge that extends around the perimeter thereof". Also, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13 to clarify that the support panel is coupled to the frame by its angled edge. All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-15 in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krauss in view of Pracht.¹ Applicant respectfully traverses said rejection for the reasons set forth below.

At a minimum, Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's assertions in the Final Office Action that Krauss discloses (i) "support panels" or (ii) tiles secured to support panels, as provided for by the claims at issue. The elements of Krauss upon which Examiner relies for his assertions are element 42

¹ On the Office Action Summary page, Examiner indicates that claims 1 and 3-15 are rejected in the present action. In the body of the Final Office Action, however, claims 5 and 7 are not referenced as being rejected even though Examiner includes comments related to these claims. The arguments made herein with respect to independent claim 1 apply equally to claims 5 and 7 and therefore, with this response, Applicant has assumed that Examiner intended to reject claims 5 and 7.

(for "support panels") and element U (for tiles). These elements in Krauss are described as an "insulating body" (column 4, line 26) and "panel unit" (column 4, line 11) respectively. With respect to element 42, the "insulating bodies" of Krauss are very different from the "support panels" as provided for by the claims at issue. First, the insulating bodies of Krauss do not have an "integral angled edge that extends around the [insulating bodies'] perimeter" as provided for by each of the independent claims. The insulating bodies of Krauss are described as follows: "Body 42 backing the panel in each case is suitably of insulating material of any well-known type and is preferably precast in a light weight slab form" (see column 4, lines 42-44). In each of the Figures of Krauss it is apparent that the insulating body 42 is a slab of insulating material. The description of Krauss does not describe, nor do the figures of Krauss illustrate, "an integral angled edge" as provided for by the claims. Krauss teaches a slab of insulation material, which is very different from the "support panels" as claimed.

Second, the insulating bodies of Krauss are not "secured substantially within said plurality of openings of said frame by said angled edge being coupled to said frame". As described above, the insulating bodies do not have an "angled edge" and therefore necessarily cannot be secured to the frame by the angled edge. Further, as shown in Figure 6, insulating body 42 is attached on its backside by elements 56 and 57 (see column 4, lines 48-60).

Third, it is apparent that elements U of Krauss do not comprise "tiles" as provided for by the claims at issue. Element U is described in Krauss as "channeled sheet metal parts" at column 3, lines 47-48. These "sheet metal parts" are very different than the "tiles" as claimed by Applicant.

Finally, Krauss not only does not provide for the "tiles" to be secured to the "panels", in fact Krauss specifically teaches away from securing "tiles" to the "panels" as provided for by the clarified claims. Krauss specifically states: "the important thing is the contact between the [insulating bodies 42 and the panels U] is limited so far as practicable" (see column 3, lines 11-13). Even assuming that Examiner is correct that insulating bodies 42 comprise "support panels" and panels U comprise "tiles"

(which he is not, for the reasons stated above), the Krauss reference states that "the important thing" is that the support panels and tiles contact each other as little as possible. This is directly opposite the teaching of the present Application, in which the tiles are secured to the panels by structural silicon. For this reason, and the other reasons above, Applicant submits that the Krauss reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of "support panels" or "structural silicon is used to secure said tiles to said panels" as provided for by the claims at issue.

Examiner admits that Krauss does not disclose tiles adhered to the panels with silicone. However, Examiner asserts that Krauss can be combined with the Pracht reference in order to provide these limitations. However, Krauss is not combinable with Pracht since Krauss does not suggest the teachings of Pracht and Pracht does not suggest the teachings of Krauss. See Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281, 227 U.S.P.Q. 657 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ("To combine references (A) and (B) properly to reach the conclusion that the subject matter of a patent would have been obvious, case law requires that there must be some teaching, suggestion, or inference in either reference (A) or (B), or both, or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art that would lead one skilled in the art to combine the relevant teachings of references (A) and (B). Consideration must be given to teachings in the references that would have led one skilled in the art away from the claimed invention. A claim cannot properly be used as a blueprint for extracting individual teachings from references."). As described above, Krauss specifically teaches away from adhering tiles to panels. The Examiner is using improper hindsight reasoning when attempting to combine these references because he is utilizing the teachings in the pending application and applying them to the prior art references in order to conclude the pending claims are unpatentable. Because Krauss specifically teaches away from adhering tiles to support panels, Applicant respectfully submits that Krauss and Pracht are not combinable and, thus, claims 1 and 3-15 are nonobvious.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/770,917

Attorney Docket: 71312-00202

Response Accompanying RCE

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Final Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7570.

Applicant believes he has submitted a check in the amount for the total fees that are due for this document, however, if any fees are due or were overpaid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Date: 15-July-2005

By:



Michael A. Schaldenbrand
Reg. No. 47,923

Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
(248) 433-7570

MAS/